

# **PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

## **Minutes**

June 14, 2007

Salisbury, North Carolina

The Historic Preservation Commission for the City of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, June 14, 2007, in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 217 S. Main Street.

The meeting was called to order by the Vice-Chair, Susan Hurt.

In addition to Susan Hurt, the following members were present: Jack Errante, Ronald Fleming, Deborah Johnson, Judy Kandl, Anne Lyles, and Anne Waters.

Absent: Kathy Walters

Susan Hurt announced the unexpected passing of the Commission's Chairman, Wayne Whitman. She presented Janet Gapen who made comments in memory of the late C. Wayne Whitman.

Following Janet Gapen's comments, Susan Hurt welcomed all persons present and explained the meeting's purpose and procedures.

### **Requests for Certificates of Appropriateness**

H-20-06    **130 W. Innes St.** – Rowan County, owner; John W. Dees, II, Attorney for applicant  
**Request:** Rehearing of H-20-06 to provide additional evidence not previously considered.

Janet Gapen informed the body present that the request #H-20-06 is a rehearing of a case that was heard last year. She explained that the Commission's Rules of Procedure allows for a rehearing provided that only new evidence not previously considered that changes the facts of the case is presented

Judy Kandl informed Commission members that she was not employed at Ramsay-Burgin-Smith at the time of the original hearing, nor was she a member of the Commission at that time.

Susan Hurt read Article 14 – Rehearings. She informed the applicants that the new evidence should be immediately presented showing that there has been substantial changes in the facts previously presented.

Jay Dees, Attorney for Rowan County and Danny Norman, Architect with Ramsay, Burgin, and Smith.

Mr. Dees began the testimony by informing the Commission that the request for the rehearing is based on communication by email between himself and Paul Fomberg, the regional representative from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and a conclusion that was reached following the conversations which was not addressed in the previous hearings.

The conclusion is that even though the Commission requested a recommendation from Mr. Fomberg, he did not technically address the method for affixing the letters, but basically said that the Board should consider affixing the letters requested in the application.

He informed the Commission that Mr. Fomberg's opinion is the same as his in that as long as the substrate can be satisfactorily repaired as it was when the building was renovated and new letters applied there was no foreseeable problem with the installation of the letters.

He said the second part of the new evidence will be the testimony from Danny Norman as to how the old letters were removed, how they were repaired and how the marble façade was cleaned and the how the current letters were affixed. He said, "We are proposing that the new letters requested would be applied in the same manner." He hopes that they can agree that the intent would not be violated with that method.

Susan Hurt stated that she was a member of the Board during the first hearing of the request and remembers that the Commission did very specifically address the issue of whether the method of affixing letters would damage the marble or not. She said hearing someone else's opinion, as from Danny Norman, does not make new evidence.

Mr. Dees responded by saying that Danny Norman's testimony will illustrate that the method of affixing the letters is repairable without damaging the substrate.

Susan Hurt again stated that she did not agree that new evidence was being presented. She said every opportunity was given to argue the clarity and ambiguity of SHPO's opinion letter and there was a unanimous agreement that the marble not be damaged. She also stated her concern of setting a precedent.

Judy Kandl asked if going before the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) would be a better option for the applicant or if it would have to be denied for that option. Susan Hurt explained that ZBA would be limited to the same facts and evidence as presented originally if it is presented as an appeal.

Anne Waters stated that she would like to hear from Mr. Norman in order to determine if there was new evidence. Ron Fleming agreed.

The chair called Danny Norman for testimony.

Mr. Norman testified that he remembers specifically when the building was cleaned and when the letters were removed. He explained that because of the weight of the letters, approximately 3 holes for each letter had been drilled into the granite. The letters, which had 2" copper studs were pulled off the building. The marble was then pressure washed with Ivory soap. The holes were matched with either colored mortal or caulk and the new letters applied. He said, "Once you are down at ground level after it was cleaned, you could not tell it was done." Mr. Norman said if new letters were to be attached to the building it would be done in the same method.

In response to a question from Jack Errante, Mr. Norman stated that Crescent Construction patched the holes.

Mr. Norman testified in response to a question from Susan Hurt that it would take 3 holes in the marble for each letter of the "*In God We Trust*" inscription, except for the "T" which would take 2. Ms. Hurt commented that that would be 35 holes.

Anne Waters said it appears to her that the marble is being unnecessarily defaced.

Mr. Norman stated that unless someone stares up at the repair with binoculars it would not be visible. He said the holes would be about 1/4" in diameter. He further stated that there should be no water damage to the substrate if it is caulked.

Susan Hurt reminded Commission members that the first letters approved were determined by the applicant to be a safety hazard because the letters were too heavy to affix with an adhesive and could possibly fall from the wall. They then came back with plastic letters which were denied by the Commission because they were not compatible with the Design Guidelines. She said, "We are in a state now where you cannot safely affix historically compatible materials without damaging the surface of the building."

In regard to damaging the building, Jay Dees said the building would not be damaged, though it would be altered. He said marble can be repaired. In fact, he continued, masonry is repaired all of the time, and it does not matter whether it is damaged intentional or unintentionally.

Susan Hurt responded by saying that it could not be restored back to its current condition with 35 caulked holes in it to what it was before.

Jack Errante stated that the intention of the Commission is to avoid intentional defacing of a historic fabric.

Judy Kandl named the following points as suggestions for new evidence: (1) there is no other way to affix the letters to the building; all ways to get the lettering on the building have been exhausted (2) there are repairs on the cornice that have been there for 19 or 20 years, and the patch is still not noticeable.

Susan Hurt agreed that Ms. Kandl's first point could be considered as new evidence because it was determined after the meeting that the letters originally approved were too heavy. However, she did not agree with the second point because the same facts were available to the county the first time around.

Judy Kandl then made the following motion based on the first point being new evidence: "I move that the discussion to this point warrants it appropriate for a rehearing."

Anne Lyles seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Ms. Hurt opened the floor for the public hearing.

Jim Sides, Rowan County Commissioner, was sworn to speak in support of the request. He testified that the county chose not to bring witnesses to the first meeting because they did not think it would be necessary. He stated that the county has no desire to do harm to the building. He also said he wanted to make it clear that the wording was not important and has no bearing on the case whatsoever. What is important, he said, is the affixing of the letters, which was done in the same manner that is proposed for the new lettering.

Amy Welch, 301 W. Marsh St., was sworn to speak in support of the request. She spoke of her agreement with statements made by Jay Dees when he described the marble as being a façade that can be repaired or replaced, and a façade that does not alter the building.

There was no one present to speak in opposition.

Following the deliberation by the Commission, Anne Lyles made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-20-06 – that Jay Dees, Attorney for Rowan County, and Danny Norman, Architect, owners of 130 W. Innes St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to provide additional evidence not previously considered on Application #H-20-06; that Jim Sides and Amy Welch appeared before the Commission to support the request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 4 Site Features and District Setting – Signage and Awnings, pages 54-55, guidelines 2-6 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-20-06 be granted to Jay Dees, Attorney for Rowan County, owner of 130 W. Innes St. to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Deborah Johnson seconded the motion. Commission members Ron Fleming, Deborah Johnson, Judy Kandl, and Anne Lyles voted AYE; Commission members Jack Errante, Susan Hurt, and Anne Waters voted NO.

**H-23-07     317 W. Thomas St. – W. Douglas & Elizabeth Kearney, owner**  
**Request:** Dry stock retaining wall, 18”-30” tall, along western property line, extending from rear of carport to rear of property; wall built on granite gravel using Pisgah brown thin veneer, requires removal of dogwood located on property line.

Doug Kearney was sworn to give testimony for the request. Staff presented slides.

Mr. Kearney testified that he would like to put in a short dry stack retaining wall between the property line to the extent of the western property line starting at the end of the carport. He testified that an existing dogwood tree located on the property line would need to be removed.

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that the tree is less than 18 inches so would not require approval.

Judy Kandl questioned the reason for the difference in the height of the wall to which Mr. Kearney testified would vary according to the required slope. He said because the slope would require a wall from 8 inches to 30 inches there would be 2 or 3 six-inch steps up to the highest point and then 1 or 2 six-inch steps going down toward the rear of the property.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition of the request.

Anne Lyles made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #ah-23-07 – that Douglas Kearney, owner of 317 W. Thomas St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to put in a dry stack retaining wall, 18”-30” tall, along western property line, extending from rear of carport to rear of property; wall built on granite gravel using Pisgah Brown thin veneer, requires removal of dogwood located on property line; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting – Fences and Walls, pages 56-59, guidelines 7, 9 and 10 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-23-07 be granted to Douglas and Elizabeth Kearney, owners of 317 W. Thomas St. to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Ron Fleming seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

H-24-07 1439 N. Main St. – Kenneth L. Nottingham, owner – **Request:** Removal of chimney located inside of house for extra space for closet and storage.

Melanie Nottingham was sworn to give testimony for the request. Staff presented slides.

Mrs. Nottingham stated that they would like to remove a cracked chimney located in the bedroom in order to make room for extra storage space. The chimney is visible from the roof line. The chimney, she testified, is no longer used.

Wendy Spry referred the members to pictures of the chimney as it appears inside the bedroom.

In response to a question from Anne Lyles, Mrs. Nottingham stated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> chimney was used for a gas heater which is no longer in use; the gas line has been removed.

Susan Hurt stated that they would need to determine if the chimney is a character defining element of a historic building.

Anne Lyles stated that the chimney could be a defining element; however, it is not an architectural feature.

Judy Kandl stated that the character defining elements of the house seems to be the roofline, the gable, the general massing. She said the bulk of the building is actually more character defining than the chimney.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Jack Errante made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-24-07 – that Melanie Nottingham, owner of 1439 N. Main St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove a chimney located inside the house for extra space for closet and storage; the chimney does extend above the roofline; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 - Changes to Buildings – Masonry, pages 26-27, guideline 2 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-24-07 be granted to Kenneth L. Nottingham, owner of 1439 N. Main St., to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Judy Kandl seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

**H-25-07      301 W. Marsh St. – Jon E. Welch & Amy D. Welch, owner**  
**Request:** Replacement of retaining wall on the S. Jackson St. facing side of the lot.

Amy D. Welch, (already sworn) came forward to give testimony for the request.

Anne Waters requested to recluse herself for the hearing because she and applicant were good friends. Judy Kandl disclosed as information to the Commission that she had shared some ideas to Ms. Welch relative to the process of requesting the proposed retaining wall.

Susan Hurt made the motion that Anne Waters recluse herself and that Judy Kandl stay; seconded by Anne Lyles, and all members voted AYE.

Ms. Welch testified that they would like to replace the existing retaining wall and presented a sample of the proposed split faced concrete block which will match the existing granite capitals on the porch pillars of the house.

The wall, she testified, would be 18 inches high. The existing wall is 8 ft. on Marsh St. and 90 ft. to the back of the house; however, the request is to reduce the length to about 60 ft. which will run to the back of the existing sun porch.

Judy Kandl questioned whether or not there had been a precedence of approval for the split faced concrete block as proposed by Ms. Welch.

Ms. Welch testified that when she was looking for other examples she did notice the retaining wall at 508 S. Fulton St. with the same concrete material.

Judy Kandl stated that sometimes there could be materials used before it was in the guidelines.

Ms. Welch informed the Commission that they had considered brick but could not find a brick that matched their brick.

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that there have been split faced concrete products approved for new construction on buildings.

Ms. Kandl also asked Ms. Welch what would be used as the cap.

Ms. Welch said, "I can't answer that." She said her guess is that it would be the same material but smooth and finished on the top.

Susan Hurt informed Ms. Welch that if it happened to be a different material she would need to come back for the approval.

Susan Hurt referred members to Fences and Walls, guideline 7 which reads: *If a new fence or wall is to be constructed, base the design on accurate documentation of a historic fence or wall, or create a new design compatible with the historic character of the building and the district.*

In response to Judy Kandl's questions in reference to the drainage lines, Ms. Welch stated that they would have 2 options (1) to route the lines to the back of their yard or (2) to have the city make a curb-cut and have the lines placed under the sidewalk to drain into the street.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition of the request.

Ron Fleming made the following motion: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-25-07 – that Amy D. Welch, owner of 301 W. Marsh St. appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a retaining wall on the South Jackson St. side of the lot; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting – Fences and Walls, pages 58-59, guidelines 2,3,7, 9 and 10 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-25-07 be granted to Jon E. and Amy D. Welch, owners of 301 W. Marsh St., to make the changes detailed in the application; the material will be split-faced, interlocking concrete block with a face that matches the concrete capitals on the house, site plans have been provided, scale of elevation has been provided and no historic materials have been replaced."

Jack Errante seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

Susan Hurt made the motion for Anne Waters to return to her seat, seconded by Jack Errante; all members voted AYE.

H-26-07      **519 S. Fulton St.** – Mr. & Mrs. Ned Storey, owner

**Request:** Replace existing retaining wall at Marsh St. side of back yard with a granite wall; the brick wall is falling down because of tree roots and age.

Charlotte Story was sworn to give testimony for the request. Staff presented slides.

Staff presented slides as Mrs. Story informed the Commission that the brick wall located in the very back of yard is being pushed down by tree roots. She would like to replace brick wall with granite. She stated that after inquiring, she was advised by a stone work professional that the wall be replaced with granite because the roots would push any brick wall down. The wall, she said, would be about 20-24 inches tall, and will be located between the back yards of 2 adjoining property owners.

Ms. Kandl noted that part of the original fence is staying, and part will be replaced with a different material. She read guideline #3 from the Fences and Wall guidelines: *Retain and preserve historic fence and wall material whenever possible. If replacement is necessary, use new material that matches the historic material in composition, size, shape, color, pattern, and texture. Consider substitute material only if the original material is not technically feasible.*

Ms. Kandl said she understands that the brick is not adequate by itself but could be feasible if used with something else that works.

In response to a question from Susan Hurt, Mrs. Story stated that the wall could only be seen by her neighbor. She said, "It is way past the shrub."

Anne Waters said they are not redesigning the wall or elevating it any more but just replacing one material with another. They are doing the best that they can to work around the roots while trying to improve the appearance of the wall.

Jack Errante and Anne Lyles agreed, and felt that the granite would look better than the brick.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition of the request.

Jack Errante made the following motion: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-26-07 – that Charlotte Story, owner of 519 S. Fulton St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a retaining wall on the Marsh St. side of the back yard with a granite wall; the brick wall is falling because of tree roots and age; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting – Fences and Walls, pages 56-59, guidelines 2,3,7, and 10 of the Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-26-07 be granted to Mr. & Mrs. Ned Story, owners of 519 S. Fulton St., to make the changes detailed in the application."

Susan Hurt added the following mitigating factor: the mitigating factors are: this is 2 adjoining rear lots with very low visibility and the company doing the repair has informed the owner that the original material won't hold against the tree roots as well as the new substitute material and that the new

Anne Lyles seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.



H-27-07     **400 Blk. N. Lee St.** – Rowan Investments, Inc., owner – Michael Lippard, agent  
**Request:** New awnings, brick sidewalk, bollards, fence, façade renovations per submitted site plans.

**POSTPONED until July.**

H-28-07     **125 S. Main St.** – Downtown Salisbury, Inc., owner – Randall Hemann, applicant  
**Request:** Repair upper façade per attached description build new storefront per attached plans.

Randy Hemann, representing Downtown Salisbury, Inc., was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Slides were shown as Mr. Hemann testified that the metal façade has been pulled off the building at 125 S. Main St. He said most of the façade is intact but some of the elements have been removed. He informed the Commission that the building at 119 S. Main St. is the identical building to 125 so they know what needs to be put back.

He testified that the proposal is to put back everything that has been removed using like materials. The windows will be wooden double hung that match the original. The scroll work and iron above the double windows will be repaired to match that at 119 S. Main St., as will the caps. He referred members to the submitted plan for the proposed new storefront, and noted that a full-light door has been changed from the 2/3 light door. The storefront will be a wood facade with true panels below the windows, a new tile entry, and a canvas awning. The showcases will remain on both sides. The up-lights will be less than a 7x7x9 inch box that will be located on the ledge. The brick will be repaired with matching brick. He further testified that a stairwell will be put in on the right hand side.

Mr. Hemann informed the Commission that he would like to have paint and tile colors approved at a later time by committee if at all possible.

Mr. Hemann responded to Judy Kandl's question in reference to the awning by saying, "That is a wood panel behind the awning." He said the awning would fit into an existing cavity underneath the brick.

Judy Kandl informed the Commission that the criteria for Architectural Metals guideline 2.4.5 should also be applied to the project because a significant portion of the repair work is metal, as well as masonry and wood.

Ms. Kandl also stated her concerns regarding the up-lighting. According to the guidelines, she said, lighting should not over emphasize the building.

Mr. Hemann stated that the proposed boxes are less than 7x7x9 inches wide with 70-watt high pressure sodium light, which has a yellow glow. He said they decided that the yellow glow would be better than a stark fluorescent or white light. The lights will be located on the 2 center columns and should flood most of the upper façade.

In response to a question from Anne Lyles he said the sister building did not have the same lighting.

Mr. Hemann said a 70-watt is not a ton of light but it will be enough to give a nice warm glow.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Anne Lyles made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-28-07 – that Randy Hemann, applicant for Downtown Salisbury, Inc., owner of 125 S. Main St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair the upper façade per attached description, build a new storefront per attached plan; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings, Storefronts, pages 20-22, guidelines 1-7 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-28-07 be granted to Randy Hemann, applicant for Downtown Salisbury, Inc., owner of 125 S. Main St. to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Ron Fleming seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

In response to a question from Jack Errante, Mr. Hemann said they hope to have the building completed by September.

**H-29-07 131/135 E. Fisher St.** – Piedmont Players Theatre, Inc., owner – John Brincefield, applicant  
**Request:** Renovations to Pool Hall Theater façade, demolition of existing car shed and fencing in rear of building.

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that the project will be a prominent project in the city. She said it was brought to her attention that because Piedmont Players is a non-profit organization they will need to begin to raise funds for the work. In order to do that, the preliminary drawings will be circulated publicly; therefore, Commission members might be able to see the plans that will later need to be approved. Staff recommended that the applicants submit for review what is now available even though they may not have all of the details worked out; yet recognizing that they will need to return at a later time when more details are available.

Perry Peterson, Architect for the project, and Reid Leonard, Director of Piedmont Players, were sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mr. Peterson began by informing the Commission that the former Friendly Cue will be turned into a theater with the main emphasis for children.

Mr. Peterson presented a slide presentation to show the history of the building beginning in 1926 when it was a laundry. He pointed out the architectural features of the building.

He testified that there would be awnings on the front façade similar to those on the Meroney Theater, which he showed. The building will also be lighted in a similar manner as the Meroney Theater. He showed pictures of the lighting and stated that it is the same lights used to light the White House.

Mr. Peterson said that they hope to find brick similar to the original brick for the front portion of the building, and then experiment with what they can do with the finishings on the brick. He said the last alternative would be to repaint the brick if they can't remove the existing paint. The entire back portion of the building will be painted in a single color.

The building, he said, is separated into two pieces – the original building and then an addition on the back. He pointed out the very large flush panels of brick on the addition which had been windows, but would remain as brick for the theater.

He informed the Commission that height is needed in order to make the building a theater. In order to get the height, a new addition is proposed that will be constructed of metal panels. He testified that the more historic portions of the building would be kept brick and identifiable and the new portions would be something new so that there would be no confusion as to what is old and what is new. The new portion will have a difference in material as well as a difference in position and location.

Mr. Perry showed on the elevation a marquee that will be located on the side corner. He was reminded by Wendy Spry that signage would require a separate permit.

In response to a question from Jack Errante who asked why a metal roof was chosen to extend the height of the interior of the building, Mr. Perry explained that metal is the preferred choice because it is a light weight material and more economical.

Mr. Perry stated that the basement of the building will be used for dressing rooms and fitting rooms and will have a lower side entrance from the street.

He continued by informing the Commission that the theater, along with the city will coordinate together on the back parking lot but those plans are not finalized yet. He said the existing privacy fence would be removed; a car shed on the property will also be removed. He further stated that mechanical equipment would be located in the rear of the building.

Janet Gapen assured the Commission that a later submittal would include a site plan to show how everything would be laid out in the rear yard.

Mr. Perry testified that their desire is to duplicate the wood entrance at Meroney for the new theater; however, it would be expensive so that could depend upon how well the fund raising goes.

Susan Hurt asked what the metal would look like to which Mr. Perry responded by saying that he would like to use a flush panel metal in a color that would complement the building. He said they would prefer to have the brick portion stand out more.

He said either steel or aluminum would be coated. However, Judy Kandl stated that according to the guidelines aluminum cladding, vinyl, and plastic siding in details are not appropriate.

During the discussion of the metal material, Janet Gapen reminded the Commission that diagonally across the street is the Firehouse Loft which has some metal details on the building that was used to invoke the industrial character that can be seen in the area.

Susan Hurt stated that the combination of the brick, stone and metal does invoke the transitional - residential, industrial, historic and modern; but the Commission needs to know what it is going to look like.

Mr. Perry said the brick masonry and metal would not be something that you'd not expect to see in a commercial building or theater.

Reid Leonard stated that they want the building to have an industrial look. He said, "Because this is a children's theater we want everything that will survive – kids with hands on the wall." He explained that they want to put a historic building back as much as possible with the brick and windows in the front but then look up and see pieces of metal across the top because that is also what would be found inside the theater.

Mr. Perry informed the Commission that they will be bringing back the exact details of what it will look like – both the interior and exterior. He said, "there won't be any question of what it is, what it will look like; it's just that we are not at that stage yet." In response to Judy Kandl who asked how soon that would be, he said they want to make sure from this meeting that their direction is o.k., so it could be less than 2 months away.

Janet Gapen suggested the possibility of working with a committee that could meet between now and the July meeting.

Anne Waters said, "It is certainly moving in the right direction from what exist right now." She said there are a lot of mitigating factors right now but she thinks they should give them the move ahead.

Judy Kandl described the project as a building with a mixture of brand new, of old that is staying and being preserved, and of old that is being ripped off and returned to a new face. She said that all the Commission can do is look at the guidelines and the building and make sure that it is appropriate. "It has nothing to do with the worthwhileness of the project, it has nothing to do with 'you need to save money, it has nothing to do with the schedule.'"

She continued by saying if a committee is the best way to do it then that is a good idea.

Janet Gapen explained that they could set up the committee tonight with about 3 people who would meet again with the applicant and staff. The committee would not take any action but would come back to the next regular meeting and report the results of the meeting with a possible recommendation.

Susan Hurt asked if the demolition needed to be approved at the present meeting, and Mr. Perry said no, they would not be doing any work until next spring.

Reid Leonard again explained that they needed to be able to start the fund raising and city staff made the recommendation that they come in, otherwise they would not have come yet.

The Commission then discussed if a Certificate of Appropriateness should be issued or if moving forward to a committee would be sufficient.

Mr. Perry asked that the Commission tell them if there is something specific that does not meet the guidelines and if they can't do it then they won't do it. He said, "We are showing it to people to raise money and if we come back here and we can't do it then we've got a mess."

Judy Kandl informed Mr. Perry that the proposed awning would be a violation of the guidelines and read the awning guidelines #13: *Mount awnings in a manner that does not obscure or damage architectural features ..... they should fit within the window or door opening; continual awnings are not appropriate.* She also read the guidelines for windows and doors.

Susan Hurt informed the Commission that another possibility would be to table the application for more information when it is available.

Mr. Perry explained that they need to know in what direction they can go before all of the construction drawings are done. He said you can't go do all the work for something and then come back and start over.

Anne Waters said they should move forward with approving the size and scale and appoint a committee to study the details. She made the motion as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-29-07 – that Reid Leonard and Perry Peterson, staff representing Piedmont Players Theater, Inc., owner of 131-135 E. Fisher St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate the pool hall theater façade and demolish the existing car shed and fence in the rear of the building; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and Chapter 3 New Construction, pages 42-45, guidelines 5-17 and Chapter 5 Demolition and Relocation - Demolition, pages 63-65, guidelines 1 and 2 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; the mitigating factor is that the current project is in a conceptual stage of design; that Certificate of Appropriateness is for the size and scale of the project, and not for the material, design, elements and rhythm of the project; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-29-07 be granted, as amended, Reid Leonard and Perry Peterson, applicants for Piedmont Players Theater, Inc., owner of 131-135 E. Fisher Street to make the changes detailed in the application."

Anne Lyles seconded the motion; Jack Errante, Ronald Fleming, Susan Hurt, Deborah Johnson, Anne Lyles, and Anne Waters voted AYE; Judy Kandl, voted NO.

H-30-07 **602 S. Fulton St.** - Carl M. Short, Jr. & Luanne B. Short, owner

**Request:** Addition of Florida room and bath behind present structure, demolition of existing deck and well-house, existing addition's tin roof to be replaced with rubber, installation of spiral staircase to roof, and addition of patio per submitted plans.

Tom Bost, agent, was sworn to give testimony for the request.

Mr. Bost testified that the applicants would like to add a Florida room and bath on the rear of their house and also a flagstone patio. The roof on the patio will be a flat single-ply rubber roof. He stated that the roof will also be utilized as a balcony as is found on other parts of the house also. The balcony will be accessed from a proposed spiral staircase. The brick will match the brick on an existing well-house that will be demolished, as will an existing wooden deck. He presented a sample of the Taylor Clay brick.

Wendy Spry showed the location for the addition and noted that it would not be visible from Fulton St.

Staff presented slides as Mr. Bost pointed to the south side elevation where 3 existing windows will remain, and showed the 6 windows that will be removed to make way for the installation of cabinets.

Mr. Bost testified that the height of the porch area will be raised to match the existing house. The windows in the addition will be custom made to match the existing windows; the exterior trim will also match the existing, and all painted White. A double French door will be located at the back with brick steps leading down to the patio. The brick steps will be 6 ft. wide and rounded; there will be no landing.

In response to a question from Jack Errante, Mr. Bost stated that the well-house was not original.

Judy Kandl stated that there was not a plan submitted for the railing and wondered if the design of the railing on the house would be modified to be compatible with new construction. She also stated there was not a plan submitted to show what the wall would look like when the 6 windows are gone. She explained that it was important for Commission members to be able to evaluate space massing, details, etc.

Jack Errante noted that the proposed brick for the area where the 6 windows would be removed is a different color from the original brick. Mr. Bost said, "It is not an exact match but it is close."

Anne Lyles suggested that the brick from the wall on the south side of the house, which will not be seen (because of the addition) be used for that area in order to have a more perfect match. Mr. Bost thought the suggestion was a great idea.

Commission members continued with questions to Mr. Bost on areas that were unclear because not enough detail had been submitted.

Ronald Fleming stated that more comprehensive drawings were needed.

Anne Lyles informed Mr. Bost that the steps and railings needed to be shown on the south side elevation, and both the existing and proposed elevations should be shown. It was also noted that the spiral staircase was not on the site plan.

Commission members agreed that the request should be tabled and sent to a committee. The following persons will make up the committee: Susan Hurt, Judy Kandl and Anne Lyles.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Susan Hurt made the motion to table and send to committee. Anne Lyles seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

**H-31-07 225 S. Fulton St.** – Keith & Janet Gapen, owner

**Request:** Fabric awnings to be installed in window openings facing W. Bank St. (5) and dormer windows (3) facing S. Fulton St.; fabric selection per attached color chart.

Janet Gapen was sworn to give testimony for the request. Staff presented slides.

Janet Gapen informed the Commission that the awnings are needed for heat control. She testified that the proposed awnings would be individual for each single window – 3 on the front and 5 on the side. The box shape awning will be on all the casement windows, and the shed style on all others. Ms. Gapen presented awning samples of the Sunbrella material and the color Putty. She explained that the blue color on her house is teal which did not match the blue awning sample.

In response to a question from Jack Errante, she stated that without maintenance the life of the awnings is 8 years; however, if hosed down and kept clean the life could be 10 years.

Anne Lyles asked if a shade tree would help control the sun; Ms. Gapen responded by informing the Commission that there is currently a shade tree on the lot but it would be years before the tree would be big enough to help shade the sun.

Janet Gapen reminded the Commission that the request from an owner at the Firehouse Lofts for window tinting to help reflect the sun's radiation was approved pending an agreement from each owner on the same side to do the same.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Ronald Fleming made the following motion: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-31-07 – that Janet Gapen, owner of 225 South Fulton Street, appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to install fabric awnings in the 5 window openings facing West Bank Street and 3 dormer windows facing South Fulton Street in the fabric and color as shown at the meeting; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 — Changes to Buildings — Windows & Doors, pages 16-19, Guideline 9 of the Residential Historic District Design

Guidelines; there were no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-31-07 be granted to Keith and Janet Gapen, owners of 225 South Fulton Street, to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Deborah Johnson seconded the motion and all members present voted AYE.

### **Other Business**

Appointment to DRAC: Janet Gapen informed the Commission that Michael Young has agreed to serve on DRAC. A motion was made, seconded and voted 7-0 for his appointment.

Nominating Committee: The following persons will serve on the nominating committee for the election of a new Chair and Vice-Chair due to the sudden death of the Chair, Wayne Whitman: Jack Errante, Ronald Fleming, and Anne Lyles.

### **Minutes**

The minutes were approved as submitted pending changes that would be emailed to the secretary, Judy Jordan.

### **Adjournment**

There being no other business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

---

Susan Hurt, Vice Chairman

---

Judy Jordan, Secretary